JACKIE SPEIER
14TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

211 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0512 (202) 225-3531 FAX: (202) 226-4183

155 BOVET ROAD, SUITE 780 SAN MATEO, CA 94402 (650) 342-0300 FAX: (650) 375-8270

WWW.SPEIER.HOUSE.GOV

Congress of the United States House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515-0512 COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

SUBCOMMITTEES:

OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATION

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

SUBCOMMITTEES:
RANKING MEMBER, ENERGY POLICY, HEALTH CARE,
AND ENTITLEMENTS
NATIONAL SECURITY

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION TASK FORCE Vice Chair

June 19, 2013

The Honorable Sally Jewell Office of the Secretary United States Department of the Interior 1849 C Street, N.W. Washington DC 20240

Dear Secretary Jewell:

I am writing to express concerns regarding the potential impact of newly adopted dog walking prohibitions within Rancho Corral de Tierra ("Rancho") on the forthcoming supplemental dog management environmental impact statement ("SEIS") for Golden Gate National Recreation Area ("GGNRA"). As GGNRA prepares to release the SEIS, I respectfully request that you work with GGNRA to ensure a fair evaluation of the property.

As you know, ownership of the 3,858-acre Rancho Park transferred from the Peninsula Open Space Trust to GGNRA in December 2011. For decades prior to the acquisition, my constituents utilized the land for recreational purposes, including off-leash dog walking, hiking and equestrian use, while maintaining the environmental integrity of the property. In contrast to this historical use, shortly following acquisition GGNRA prohibited dogs from 80% of the land and required dogs to be leashed on the remaining 20%.

While I appreciate that GGNRA management is charged with the important responsibility of preserving the environmental sustainability of the land, I am concerned that this recent policy shift fails to strike the right balance between environmental conservation and recreation, which was emphasized in the GGNRA founding charter. Procedurally, the ban on dog walking in 80% of the park changes the anticipated "no action" or baseline scenario for the SEIS. I understand that any alternative to status quo would be measured as compared to an 80% ban scenario, not the decades-long history of off-leash dog walking at Rancho. My constituents are concerned that a modified baseline would create a fundamental error in the SEIS by distorting the analysis of recreational impacts.

In addition, I am concerned with the potential costs that may be associated with correcting the baseline following, rather than prior to, the release of the SEIS. If this issue is not properly addressed, GGNRA could be required to significantly modify its SEIS, raising the possibility of a third round of public comment, and delaying this process even

further. My constituents have also raised concerns that that the current off-leash prohibition may be in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act because it was enacted without public input.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you work with GGNRA management to ensure a complete and correct baseline analysis is undertaken before the SEIS release this summer.

Mulue

All the best,

Jack e Speier

Member of Congress

Cc:

Jon Jarvis, Director, National Park Service Frank Dean, Superintendent, GGNRA